

REMARKS

The examiner listed several errors to the specification, which have been corrected.

The examiner rejected claim 1, 2, 4, 7, 13 and 14 as being anticipated by Ho.

The claims have been amended to clarify that the **elevator** is an **elevator car** for carrying passengers and not a lift 70 as in Ho, which does not have an enclosed area or car for carrying passengers. Further, the **platform** has been amended to an **enclosed corridor**, which is enclosed for carrying passengers. Ho does not have the feature of an enclosed passenger carrying corridor. Therefore the elements in the amended claims are not found in Ho and the amended claims are allowable over the 102 rejection.

The examiner stated that in Claim 4 Ho disclosed a vertically mobile platform 71 supporting a corridor. However there is no corridor in Ho. Ho has a platform. The applicant now claims an enclosed corridor which is absent in Ho. Further claim 4 has been canceled and the limitation of the corridor in claim 4 has been added to claim 1.

With claim 1 now allowable the applicant believes that dependent claims 2-12 are also allowable.

The examiner rejected claim 13 as being anticipated by Ho.

The applicant has amended the claims to show that enclosed elevator cars and an enclosed corridor are being used to haul passengers up and down the outside of a building.

The open elevator and open platform of Ho are not user friendly as many people are afraid of

heights and would be reluctant to use the Ho invention. Further the enclosed elevator car and corridor are more protective of the passengers in any weather and in case of fire, protects the passengers from heat and smoke.

The examiner stated that claim 14 was rejected as being anticipated by Ho having a second elevator on the building. However Ho does not disclose using a second elevator in conjunction with the first elevators and corridor as the applicant does. Ho merely shows two elevators in operation at the same time individually or between a platform.

The examiner rejected claims 3 and 6 as being obvious over Ho in view of Bates as Bates shows the pivotal connection between the elevators and the platform.

The amended claims to the elevator cars and the enclosed corridor have features not in the combination of Ho and Bates. Since amended claim 1 is believed to be allowable dependent claims 3 and 6 are believed to be allowable.

The examiner rejected claims 5, 11 and 18 as being obvious over Ho in view of Karanouh.

The claims have been amended to an enclosed corridor, which is not shown in Ho or Karanouh. The scaffolding of Karanouh is not shown on the top of an enclosed corridor. Therefore the claims are believed to be allowable over the references.

The examiner rejected claims 12 as being obvious over Ho in view of Takeuchi. The examiner stated that the doors, not having reference numbers in Fig. 1, are on the corridor, but there is no corridor, there is a veranda and the doors are not on the veranda but on the

structure the veranda is attached to. Therefore the claims particularly as amended are allowable over the references.

The examiner rejected claims 5, 11 and 16 as being obvious over Ho in view of Cox.

The examiner stated Cox shows a carriage 21 with a crane 24 running on rails 22 and 23.

Cox does not show the claimed invention, as there is no elevator with a crane thereon running on a rail. Cox shows a horizontal rail with a carriage, not the claimed elevator car with a crane on it.

For claim 15 Cox does not show the elevator car with a crane on it working on the rails to access the corridor or the other elevators.

For claim 16 Cox does not show a pod on the crane on an elevator, as there is no elevator and the combination of Cox with its horizontal rails makes not sense in combination with a carriage, on an elevator with vertical rails, as the combination is nonfunctional.

The examiner rejected claims 9 and 10 as being obvious over Ho in view of Larson.

However Larson relates to a loading bridge for use by passengers entering and leaving an airplane. In particular it relates to the accordion fabric which the invention in Larson replace with articulated U shaped ribs and parallel side struts. This has nothing to do with an enclosed corridor having fireproof walls, floors and ceilings as in the amended claims as there is no accordion like structure.

The examiner rejected claim 17 over Ho stating Ho discloses a corridor. However the claims as amended call for an enclosed corridor, which Ho does not show.

Since independent claims 1 and 13 as amended are believed to be allowable, for the reasons shown above, all dependent claims are also believed to be allowable.